

What is lost is the presence of the things that help us to tell the story; to have the objects, records, and the space to support and to tell what has happened and who we are. At the end, after the event, the victors have stocked their archives and erased the voices and records of those who have been killed or otherwise effaced. We must look at what remains and also what is missing in the archive. The loss spans both.

In framing the archive as an act and a space covering each temporal moment of an event, we turn now to the language and logic of the archive to see where those elements reside. This becomes a question of not only the power of an archive, but a question of the reflexive nature of the archive as a place and a process that influences the curation and construction of narratives.

Notes

- 1 The keeping of records in the Nazi concentration camps on prototype IBM computers was effected using IBM's Hollerith punchcard technology. For more information on this, see Edwin Black's (2002) investigation of the relationship between the IBM corporation and the Holocaust.
- 2 In 1988, the building of a bridge from Goolwa in South Australia to Hindmarsh Island (Kumarangk) was proposed. Kumarangk is in the traditional lands of the Ngarrindjeri people. A group of Ngarrindjeri women claimed that to build the bridge would be to disrupt and destroy a site of cultural significance to them. The South Australian Hindmarsh Bridge Royal Commission was formed, and in 1995 it concluded that the claim of what became known as 'secret women's business' was fictitious. However, as Claire Smith and Gary Jackson (2006) write of the Commission in their discussion of the decolonisation of Australian sites: "By interpreting the world from the Western perspective of relatively open access to knowledge, this decision failed to recognize that Indigenous knowledge often is segmented by qualities such as age and gender, creating a fine and intangible cultural web. Embedded in a Western tradition of dichotomized hierarchies, the commission consistently gave greater credence to historical and ethnographic records of European scholars than to Indigenous oral histories" (317).